

REMARKS

The office action has been carefully considered together with the present application and amendments have been made to claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 12 in an effort to place the application in condition for immediate allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests the examiner to withdraw the objection to the drawings. It is believed that the application fully satisfies 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) and that the drawings do show every feature of the *invention* specified in the claims. It is believed that the examiner incorrectly applies the drawing requirement in this case. The examiner states that the drawings must show every feature of the *invention* specified in the claims. Claim 1, for example, is directed to an apparatus for interfacing a media access controller (MAC) and a physical layer device (PHY). The media access controller and the physical layer device are *not* part of the *invention*. The invention is an apparatus for interfacing these two components.

The apparatus set forth in claim 1 comprises a multiplexer for mapping data and control signals that are normally applied to a predetermined number of pins to a lesser number of pins. The apparatus is shown in Fig. 1 and therefore satisfies the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). This is not a specious argument. For example, if a radio for a car is being claimed and the word car is recited in the preamble of the claim, there is no requirement that a drawing of a car be included, because the car is not the invention; it is the radio that is. Many other examples could be described. The point is that just because an object is mentioned in a claim preamble does not mean it is part of the invention and therefore must be illustrated in a drawing.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, claim 1 has been amended to remove the means term. The claim now states that the apparatus comprises a multiplexer for mapping data and control signals that are normally applied to a predetermined number of pins to a lesser number of pins. This is not a means claim and should not be treated as such. Therefore *Ex parte Bullock* does not apply, and this rejection is legitimately traversed.

With regard to the use of phrase "significant lesser number", the offending term "significantly" has been deleted. With regard to the confusion relating to clock rate and clock signal in claims 3, 4 and 8, it is now believed that the

amendments that have been made which provide antecedent basis either by the addition of the word “clock” in claim 1 (referring to a predetermined clock rate) and changing the dependency of claim 3 to refer to claim 2 which provides antecedent basis for “a clock signal having the predetermined rate”. In claim 8, the claim has been amended to read “which interface transfers data responsive to receiving a clock signal having a predetermined clock rate”. All of these changes are believed to traverse the rejections that are based upon either the clock signal or clock rate.


With regard to claim 12, it has been amended to indicate that the CRS and COL signals are control signals which is clearly the case. It is applicant’s position that it doesn’t really matter what these signals do in detail, but it is known to those of ordinary skill in the art that a CRS signal is a carrier sense signal and the COL signal is a collision signal. Both of these signals are part of a MAC transmit process as is known to those of ordinary skill in the networking art.

Applicant has noted the examiner’s remarks responding to applicant’s arguments. It is still believed that the exhibits to the Declaration of Daniel J. Dove that includes the system diagram which is the same as Fig. 1 of the present application as well as the timing diagrams disclosed in those exhibits which are also shown in Fig. 2 are important in establishing that those of ordinary skill in the networking art are well aware of the subject matter of the present application and understand it. The specification shows the same system diagram and timing diagrams as appears in those exhibits. The drawing and specification clearly describe what is meant by a gigabit media independent interface as well as a 10 bit interface. The application is believed to fully comply with the drawing requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) and the drawing objection should be withdrawn and the application passed to issue.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims presently appearing in the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Roger D. Greer
Registration No. 26,174

August 31, 2006

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978